

-5-

Jason, Jr. *et al.*  
Appl. No. 09/605,361**Remarks**

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment to the Claims, claims 13, 16, and 19-28 are pending in the application, of which claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 27 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 27 are sought to be amended. No new matter is embraced by this amendment and its entry is respectfully requested. Based on the above Amendment and the remarks set forth below, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner, on page 2 of the Office Action, has rejected claims 13, 16, and 19-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,519,636 to Engel *et al.* (hereinafter "Engel"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Based on the remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

To anticipate a claim of a pending application, a single reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1397 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The exclusion of a claimed element from the single source is enough to negate anticipation by that reference. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

With respect to independent claim 13, Engel does not teach or suggest every element of Applicants' claimed invention. For example, referring to independent claim 13, Engel does not teach at least the following claimed element:

-6-

Jason, Jr. *et al.*  
Appl. No. 09/605,361

a network interceptor to couple the client processor with the transmission control protocol, wherein the network interceptor responds to the socket being closed by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association.

The present invention deletes the security association after it has determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association. Unlike the present invention, Engel teaches a disconnect socket trigger event and a delete rule trigger event. *Engel*, col. 10, lines 5-17; col. 14, lines 29-30. Disconnect socket is triggered when a TCP connection terminates or a UDP socket is disconnected. *Engel*, col. 10, lines 5-7. The disconnect socket trigger disassociates the socket from any rule set. Disassociation refers to breaking up bidirectional associations. *Id.* at lines 7-9. The delete rule trigger event contains the flow parameters that uniquely identify the rule that is to be deleted. *Engel*, col. 14, lines 30-31. For the delete rule trigger event, if the rule is successfully located in the rule database, it is *disassociated from all sockets* and removed from the database. *Id.* at lines 31-37. Thus, unlike the present invention, which teaches that the network interceptor responds to the socket being closed by determining whether any other socket is correlated with the security association, and if it is determined that no other socket is correlated with the security association, deleting the security association, Engel teaches automatically disassociating the socket from any rule set when a TCP connection terminates or a UDP socket is disconnected. In Engel, if the rule is located in the rule database, the rule is disassociated from *all sockets* and removed from the database.

-7-

Jason, Jr. *et al.*  
Appl. No. 09/605,361

Applicants' independent claims 16, 22, 24, and 27 recite similar elements to the elements of claim 13. Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not anticipated by Engel. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 13, 16, 22, 24, and 27, and the claims that depend therefrom.

-8-

Jason, Jr. et al.  
Appl. No. 09/605,361**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all currently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

*Crystal D. Sayles*

Crystal D. Sayles  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
Registration No. 44,318  
(703) 633-6829

Dated: Oct. 12, 2004

c/o Intel Americas, Inc.  
4030 Lafayette Center Drive  
Building LF3  
Chantilly, VA 20151

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below	
By: <u><i>Serita Evans</i></u> Serita Evans	Date: Oct. 12, 2004